



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

52

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,427	03/27/2001	Michael A. Mansfield	10004186-1	4554

7590 03/15/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PHAN, TAM T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/819,427

Applicant(s)

MANSFIELD ET AL.

Examiner

Tam (Jenny) Phan

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-11,13-17,19-21,23-27 and 29-41 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-11,13-17,19-21,23-27 and 29-41 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. Amendment received on 10/26/2004 has been entered. Claims 2, 8, 12, 18, 22, 28 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 19-21, 23-27, 29-31, 33-35 are currently amended. Claims 37-41 are newly added.
2. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 19-21, 23-27, and 29-41 are presented for examination.

Priority

3. No priority claims have been made.
4. The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in this application is 03/27/2001.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 19-21, 23-27, 29-33, and 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. Patent Number 5,717,923) in view of Sullivan et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,542,898), hereinafter referred to as Sullivan.
7. Regarding claim 1, Dedrick disclosed a method for providing personalized customer support (Title, Abstract) comprising: receiving customer information from a customer (Abstract, Figures 3-4, column 2 lines 4-7, column 3 lines 37-55); creating a profile for the customer that includes the received customer information (column 3 lines 37-55, column 5 lines 50-59); evaluating the customer information contained in the profile (column 6 lines 34-

Art Unit: 2144

52, column 19 lines 13-26); and presenting the customer support information to the customer in at least one personalized web page (column 4 lines 11-23, column 6 lines 34-52, column 19 lines 13-26).

8. Dedrick taught the invention substantially as claimed. However, Dedrick did not expressly teach a method wherein the customer information including information as to products that the customer uses and customer support information is identified specifically relevant to the products that the customer uses.

9. Dedrick suggested exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the personalized customer support method of Dedrick to provide customer support to products that the customer uses (Figure 8, column 17 lines 17-25, column 1 lines 27-36, lines 59-65).

10. Sullivan disclosed a method wherein the customer information including information as to products that the customer uses and customer support information is identified specifically relevant to the products that the customer uses (Figures 9-11, column 1 lines 42-51, column 2 lines 16-31, column 8 lines 56-67, column 9 lines 37-53).

11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Burkey with the teachings of Cheng to provide customer support information for computer products that the customer uses in order to in order to provide online technical support services to diagnose and solve hardware or software problems that customers encounter as they use their products (Sullivan, column 1 lines 20-31) since as businesses continue to move on-line, distributed computing environments become more complex and, thus, more difficult to troubleshoot (Sullivan, column 1 lines 19-31).

12. Regarding claims 3 and 4, Dedrick and Sullivan disclosed a method wherein the step of received customer information further includes user profile and demographics information

such as employer, job title, business areas of interest, personal preferences [products the customer uses, customer's business, and customer's level of technical expertise] (Dedrick, column 3 lines 37-67, Sullivan, column 10 lines 13-29, column 11 lines 10-26). Other subsets of user profile and demographics information that are disclosed by Dedrick are personality traits, personal preferences, preferred learning modes, willingness to participate in survey, etc.

13. Regarding claim 5, Dedrick disclosed a method wherein receiving customer information comprises receiving information from an online customer survey that includes a series of questions that are posed to the customer (column 3 lines 43-67).

14. Regarding claim 6, Dedrick disclosed a method wherein identifying customer support information cross-referencing the customer information with information contained within a library database (Abstract, column 2 lines 3-24, column 6 lines 34-52, column 7 lines 36-56, column 8 lines 37-48).

15. Regarding claim 7, Dedrick disclosed a method wherein identifying customer support information comprises cross-referencing the customer information with data modules contained within the library database (Abstract, column 2 lines 3-24, column 6 lines 34-52, column 7 lines 36-56, column 8 lines 37-48).

16. Regarding claim 9, Dedrick disclosed a method wherein the at least one personalized web page only includes customer support information that is relevant to one or both of the products the customer uses and the customer's business (column 3 lines 37-67, column 4 lines 44-55, column 6 lines 34-52, column 7 lines 36-56).

17. Regarding claim 10, Dedrick disclosed a method wherein presenting the customer support information to the customer comprises presenting information through multimedia

Art Unit: 2144

content [audio and video instructions] to the customer (column 4 lines 11-23, lines 44-55, column 6 lines 53-63, column 15 lines 17-36).

18. Regarding claims 11, 13-17, and 19-20, the system for providing personalized customer support corresponds directly to the method of claim 1-, 3-7, and 9-10, and thus these claims are rejected using the same rationale.

19. Regarding claims 21, 23-27, 29-30, the computer readable medium having software for providing personalized customer support corresponds directly to the method of claim 1, 3-7, and 9-10, and the system of claims 11, 13-17, and 19-20, and thus these claims are rejected using the same rationale.

20. Regarding claim 31, Dedrick and Sullivan combined disclose a method for providing personalized customer support (Dedrick, Title, Abstract; Sullivan, Title, Abstract, Figures 9-11), comprising: receiving information from a customer about the products the customer uses the customer's business and the customer's level of technical expertise; evaluating the customer information; creating a customer profile based upon the evaluation of the customer information; retrieving customer support information modules that are specifically relevant to the customer profile and therefore the products the customer uses the customer's business and the customer's level of technical expertise; and automatically generating a personalized web page containing the retrieved customer support information (Dedrick, Title, Abstract, column 2 lines 3-24, column 3 lines 37-67, column 4 lines 11-23, column 6 lines 34-52, column 19 lines 13-26; Sullivan, Title, Abstract, Figures 9-11, column 8 lines 56-67, column 9 lines 37-53, column 10 lines 13-30, column 11 lines 10-26).

21. Regarding claim 32, Dedrick disclosed a method wherein personalized web pages relevant to training, troubleshooting, and database information are respectively automatically

Art Unit: 2144

generated (column 3 lines 43-55, column 5 lines 34-49, column 5 line 60-column 6 line 3, column 6 lines 53-63).

22. Regarding claim 33, Dedrick disclosed a method further comprising responding to questions posed and issues raised by customers online (column 3 lines 62-64, column 8 lines 25-47).

23. Regarding claim 36, Sullivan disclosed a method wherein the information as to products that the customer uses includes at least one of a make and model of a product, a present configuration of the product, an application used with the product, and a configuration of a network to which the product is connected (column 6 lines 21-37, column 7 lines 38-57).

24. Regarding claim 37, Sullivan disclosed a method wherein the information about the customer's business includes at least one of the type and volume of the business, the number and size of its locations, the number of users of computing equipment, the nature of the use of the computing equipment, and the configuration of the locations (column 7 lines 38-57).

25. Regarding claim 38, Sullivan disclosed a method wherein the information about the customer's level of technical expertise includes an indication as to whether the customer is at a novice level, an intermediate level, or an advanced level (column 9 lines 13-29, column 11 lines 10-26).

26. Regarding claim 39, Sullivan disclosed a method wherein presenting the customer support information to the customer comprises presenting tutorial information as to initialization and configuration of a product that the customer uses (Figures 8-11, column 9 lines 3-14).

27. Regarding claim 40, Sullivan disclosed a method wherein presenting the customer support information to the customer comprises presenting troubleshooting information that is directed at solving problems that are being experienced by the customer with a product that the customer uses (Figures 9-11, column 6 lines 54-59, column 7 lines 38-57).

28. Regarding claim 41, Sullivan disclosed a method wherein presenting the customer support information to the customer comprises presenting optimization information directed at optimizing performance of a product that the customer uses (column 6 lines 21-37, column 9 lines 3-14).

29. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Dedrick and Sullivan, claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 19-21, 23-27, 29-33, and 36-41 are rejected.

30. Claims 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. Patent Number 5,717,923) in view of Sullivan et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,542,898), hereinafter referred to as Sullivan, and further in view of Moshfeghi et al. (U.S. Patent Number (6, 076,166), hereinafter referred to as Moshfeghi.

31. Regarding claim 34, Dedrick disclosed method for providing personalized customer support (Title, Abstract) comprising: receiving customer information from a customer (Abstract, Figures 3-4, column 2 lines 4-7, column 3 lines 37-55); creating a profile for the customer that includes the received customer information (column 3 lines 37-55, column 5 lines 50-59); evaluating the customer information contained in the profile (column 6 lines 34-52, column 19 lines 13-26); and presenting the customer support information to the customer in at least one personalized web page (column 4 lines 11-23, column 6 lines 34-52, column 19 lines 13-26). Sullivan disclosed a method wherein the customer information including

Art Unit: 2144

information as to products that the customer uses and customer support information is identified specifically relevant to the products that the customer uses (Figures 9-11, column 1 lines 42-51, column 2 lines 16-31, column 8 lines 56-67, column 9 lines 37-53).

32. The combination of Dedrick and Sullivan taught the invention substantially as claimed. However, The combination of Dedrick and Sullivan did not expressly teach a step of providing information as to designing a computing system specific to the customer's needs.

33. Dedrick suggested exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method with the computer system computing system specific to the customer's needs (column 2 line 62-column 3 line 3, column 5 lines 4-19).

34. In an analogous art, Moshfeghi disclosed a method of providing information as to designing a computing system specific to the customer's needs (Abstract, column 4 lines 11-38, column 7 lines 8-19).

35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Dedrick with the teachings of Moshfeghi to include a step of providing information as to designing a computing system specific to the customer's needs in order to take into account user equipment environment information (Moshfeghi, column 7 lines 40-48) since computing system imposed certain constraint on the personalized requested content (Abstract, column 7 lines 40-48).

36. Regarding claim 35, Dedrick disclosed a method further comprising providing an evaluation of the customer's existing computing system (column 4 lines 11-38, column 7 lines 8-19).

37. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Dedrick and Moshfeghi, claims 34-35 are rejected.

38. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 19-21, 23-27, and 29-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkey et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,446,076), hereinafter referred to as Burkey, in view of Cheng et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,457,076), hereinafter referred to as Cheng.

39. Burkey disclosed a method for providing personalized customer support comprising: receiving customer information from a customer; creating a profile for the customer that includes the received customer information; evaluating the customer information contained in the profile; and presenting the customer support information to the customer in at least one personalized web page (Figures 10A-11, column 28 line 34-column 29 line 5, column 29 line 41-column 30 line 6, column 34 lines 21-36, column 47 lines 21-33).

40. Burkey taught the invention substantially as claimed. However, Burkey did not expressly teach a method wherein the customer information including information as to products that the customer uses and customer support information is identified specifically relevant to the products that the customer uses.

41. Burkey suggested exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the personalized customer support method of Burkey to provide customer support to products that the customer uses (column 32 lines 51-62, column 47 lines 11-17).

42. Cheng disclosed a method wherein the customer information including information as to products that the customer uses and customer support information is identified specifically relevant to the products that the customer uses (Abstract, Figures 3-4, Figures 17a-17d, column 4 lines 13-40, column 6 lines 31-50).

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Burkey with the teachings of Cheng to provide customer support information for products that the customer uses in order to keep customer inform of new product features (column 4 lines 13-40) since many customers might remain unaware of the new features/updates that are available to the products that they use (column 1 lines 35-56).

44. Regarding claims 3 and 4, Burkey disclosed a method wherein the received customer information includes receiving user profile and demographics information [products the customer uses, customer's business, and customer's technical expertise] (Figures 10A-11, column 28 lines 34-60, column 41-63, column 32 lines 11-28). Note: products the customer uses, customer's business, and customer's technical expertise are subsets of user preference and demographics information. Other well-known subsets of user profile and demographics information that are important to personalizing support information are personal preferences, behavioral information, history, profession, etc.

45. Regarding claim 5, Burkey disclosed a method wherein receiving customer information comprises receiving information from an online customer survey that includes a series of questions that are posed to the customer (Figure 21, column 28 lines 46-60, column 34 lines 21-36).

46. Regarding claim 6, Burkey disclosed a method wherein the step of identifying customer support information relevant to the customer information comprises the step of cross-referencing the customer information with information contained within a library database (Figures 10A-11 & 18, column 29 line 41-column 30 line 6, column 34 lines 21-36).

47. Regarding claim 7, Burkey disclosed a method wherein identifying customer support information comprises cross-referencing the customer information with data modules contained within the library database (Figures 10A-11 & 18, column 29 line 41-column 30 line 6, column 34 lines 21-36).

48. Regarding claim 9, Burkey disclosed a method wherein the at least one personalized web page only includes customer support information that is relevant to one or both of the products the customer uses and the customer's business (column 30 lines 52-column 31 line 28).

49. Regarding claim 10, Burkey disclosed a method wherein presenting the customer support information to the customer comprises presenting information through multimedia-rich form [audio and video instructions] to the customer (column 34 lines 46-61, column 40 lines 1-8).

50. Regarding claims 11, 13-17, and 19-20, the system for providing personalized customer support corresponds directly to the method of claim 1-, 3-7, and 9-10, and thus these claims are rejected using the same rationale.

51. Regarding claims 21, 23-27, 29-30, the computer readable medium having software for providing personalized customer support corresponds directly to the method of claim 1, 3-7, and 9-10, and the system of claims 11, 13-17, and 19-20, and thus these claims are rejected using the same rationale.

52. Regarding claim 31, combined disclose a method for providing personalized customer support (Burkey, Abstract, Figures 10A, 20-23; Cheng, Abstract, Figures 3, 17a-17d), comprising: receiving information from a customer about the products the customer uses the customer's business and the customer's level of technical expertise; evaluating the customer

information; creating a customer profile based upon the evaluation of the customer information; retrieving customer support information modules that are specifically relevant to the customer profile and therefore the products the customer uses the customer's business and the customer's level of technical expertise; and automatically generating a personalized web page containing the retrieved customer support information (Burkey, Figures 10A-11, column 28 line 34-column 29 line 5, column 29 line 41-column 30 line 6, column 30 lines 15-33, column 34 lines 21-36, lines 46-61, column 47 lines 21-33; Cheng Abstract, Figures 3-4, Figures 17a-17d, column 4 lines 13-40, column 6 lines 31-50).

53. Regarding claim 32, Burkey disclosed a method wherein personalized web pages relevant to training, troubleshooting, and database information are respectively automatically generated (Figure 25, column 28 lines 46-57, column 38 lines 6-15, lines 46-64, column 39 lines 2-22).

54. Regarding claim 33, Burkey disclosed a method further comprising responding to questions posed and issues raised by customers online (column 28 lines 46-60, column 29 lines 17-23, column 31 lines 11-27, column 34 lines 21-35, lines 46-60, column 38 lines 6-15).

55. Regarding claim 34, Burkey disclosed a method further comprising providing information as to designing a computing system specific to the customer's needs (column 33 lines 19-32, lines 45-53, column 39 lines 5-22, column 40 lines 1-8).

56. Regarding claim 35, Burkey disclosed a method further comprising providing an evaluation of the customer's existing computing system (column 33 lines 19-32, lines 45-53, column 39 lines 5-22, column 40 lines 1-8).

57. Regarding claim 36, Cheng disclosed a method wherein the information as to products that the customer uses includes at least one of a make and model of a product, a present configuration of the product, an application used with the product, and a configuration of a network to which the product is connected (Figures 4 and 8, column 2 lines 25-33, column 5 lines 1-7, column 15 lines 32-36).

58. Regarding claim 37, Cheng disclosed a method wherein the information about the customer's business includes at least one of the type and volume of the business, the number and size of its locations, the number of users of computing equipment, the nature of the use of the computing equipment, and the configuration of the locations (column 6 lines 56-63, column 18 lines 42-53, column 21 lines 55-59).

59. Regarding claim 38, Burkey disclosed a method wherein the information about the customer's level of technical expertise includes an indication as to whether the customer is at a novice level, an intermediate level, or an advanced level [user profiles/user preferences] (Figures 10A-11, column 28 lines 34-60, column 41-63, column 32 lines 11-28).

60. Regarding claim 39, Cheng disclosed a method wherein presenting the customer support information to the customer comprises presenting tutorial information as to initialization and configuration of a product that the customer uses (column 4 lines 31-39, column 5 lines 1-7).

61. Regarding claim 40, Cheng disclosed a method wherein presenting the customer support information to the customer comprises presenting troubleshooting information that is directed at solving problems that are being experienced by the customer with a product that the customer uses (column 1 lines 35-47, column 4 lines 31-39, column 5 lines 1-7).

62. Regarding claim 41, Cheng disclosed a method wherein presenting the customer support information to the customer comprises presenting optimization information directed at optimizing performance of a product that the customer uses (Figure 2, column 4 lines 13-29).

63. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Burkey and Cheng, claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 19-21, 23-27, and 29-41 are rejected.

Response to Arguments

64. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 19-21, 23-27, and 29-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

65. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "customer service") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

66. In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "personalized customer support" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

67. In response to Applicant's argument regarding the dependent claims, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the

Art Unit: 2144

language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. By stating that the reference does not teach the claimed limitations is not sufficient to overcome the rejection.

68. As the rejection reads, Examiner asserts that the combination of these teachings render the claimed invention obvious.

Conclusion

69. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

70. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Refer to the enclosed PTO-892 for details.

71. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam (Jenny) Phan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3930. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 2144

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski can be reached on (571) 272-3925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



William Cuchlinski
SPE
Art Unit 2144
(571) 272-3925

tp
March 5, 2005